

DRAWINGS

Formal Drawings

The indication by the Examiner in the recent Office Action that the formal drawings were approved by the Draftsman is noted with appreciation.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status

No claims have been added or canceled by this amendment. Independent claims 1, 29, and 45 with respective claims 2-28, 30-44 and 46-57 depending therefrom will remain for further consideration.

More Clearly Defined

The claims in this application have been revised to voluntarily further clarify Applicant's unique invention. Applicant maintains that the claims as filed were patentable over the art of record. However, to expedite issuance of this application, reconsideration of the claims in light of the amendments and for the following reasons is respectfully requested.

Claim History - 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16, 21-36, 40-51 and 53-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Everingham in view of Kara. The Examiner rejected claims 17-20, 36-39 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Everingham in view of Kara and in further view of Geiger et al. This rejection is traversed.

The claims, as amended, recite that documents that are sent be encrypted for security. In contrast, Everingham merely uses a browser to send documents within a "client-based" system, in other words, an internal office server-based network. There would be no reason in Everingham to use high level encryption transferring documents

within the "client-based" system. In such a system there is no need for verification or authenticity checking.

The present invention, in contrast, recognizes the importance of security in transmitting messages or documents within or outside of a closed network, and the importance of having a document secured at all times. For this reason, an escrow encryption key is provided to encrypt messages when the recipient does not have an encryption key. As recited in claims 1, 29 and 45, the claims require the ability to assign an escrow key and the ability to assign the recipient's public key to encrypt a document.

The system queries whether the recipient's public key is known, and if not, assigns the encryption key. Kara, by contrast, only uses a recipient public key, and if one is not found, forces the user to generate a recipient key before the document can be sent. However, the present invention has the advantage of being able to protect the document prior to the recipient signing up for a public key by encrypting the document with the escrow key. To be effective, security requires an end to end policy that protects the document from the eyes of snoopers as well as from the administrators of the system, only by keeping the documents protected by having a system which can use an escrow encryption key when the recipient's public key can provide this level of security. Nowhere is this done by Everingham, and Kara does not cure this deficiency, and only through impermissible hindsight is this extra level of security seen and applied by combination with outside references. Further Kara only applies to one particular document over an insecure network to a remote location, there is no motivation for combining Kara with Everingham except through hindsight, as Everingham deals with routing documents and does not

necessarily apply to a long listing of routing participants. There is no showing that the system of Kara would be compatible with the system of Kara which requires outside certification agents and resident programs to assign recipient public keys. For at least these reasons, the claims, especially claims 1, 29 and 45 should be allowed over the art of record.

As to claims 8 & 9, Everingham specifically teaches that the routing list is generated and attached to the document for routing. (see col. 3, line 50 through col. 4, line 12) No where does Everingham suggest that a routing list can be kept as a separate document including a domain name for a cite containing routing lists or an e-mail address containing the routing list. For at least these reasons, claims 8 & 9 by their original recitations should be allowable over the art of record.

The remaining claims depend on claims 1, 29 or 45 and should be allowable for at least the reasons recited above.

Summary

Applicants have made a diligent and bona fide effort to answer each and every ground for rejection or objection to the specification including the claims and to place the application in condition for final disposition. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested, and for the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition to be passed to issue and such action is earnestly solicited. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Robert N. Blackmon, Applicants' Attorney at 703-684-5633 to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application.

Dated: September 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Robert N. Blackmon
Reg. No. 39494
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Merek, Blackmon & Voorhees, LLC
673 S. Washington St.
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Tel. 703-684-5633
Fax. 703-684-5637
E-mail: RNB@BlackmonLaw.com